

**SOUTH DAKOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION**

**Belle Fourche School District
Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process Report 2001-2002**

Team Members : Jan Elsing, Office of Special Education, Chris Sargent, Linda Shirley, and Sandy Grey Eagle, Education Specialists

Dates of On Site Visit: April 23-25, 2002

Date of Report: July 9, 2002

This report contains the results of the steering committee's self-assessment and the validation of the self-assessment by the Office of Special Education. The report addresses six principles – General Supervision, Free Appropriate Public Education, Appropriate Evaluation, Procedural Safeguards, Individualized Education Program and Least Restrictive Environment. Each principle is rated based on the following scale:

Promising Practice	The district/agency exceeds this requirement through the implementation of innovative, high-quality programming and instructional practices.
Maintenance	The district/agency consistently meets this requirement.
Needs Improvement	The district/agency has met this requirement but has identified areas of weakness that left unaddressed may result in non-compliance.
Out of Compliance	The district/agency consistently does not meet this requirement.
Not applicable	In a small number of cases, the standard may not be applicable for your district/agency. If an item is not applicable, the steering committee should briefly explain why the item is NA. Example – no private schools within the district boundaries.

Principle 1 – General Supervision
--

General supervision means the school district's administrative responsibilities to ensure federal and state regulations are implemented and a free appropriate public education is provided for each eligible child with a disability. The specific areas addressed in principle one are child find, referral procedures, children voluntarily enrolled by parents in private schools, students placed by the school district, improving results through performance goals and indicators (assessment, drop out, graduation), professional development, suspension and expulsion rates.

Steering Committee Self-Assessment Summary

Data sources used:

- ? Comprehensive plan
- ? State data table on age and placement alternatives
- ? State data table on Early Intervention (Part C) exit information
- ? State data table on due process hearing requests
- ? State data table on personnel

- ? Belle Fourche School District Administrative Manual
- ? Grant applications
- ? Local personnel data tables
- ? Personnel records
- ? Professional development agendas
- ? Professional development evaluations
- ? Professional development needs analysis
- ? Job descriptions
- ? Interagency agreements
- ? Surveys
- ? Child count
- ? Child find records
- ? Letters to private schools
- ? Letters to home school parents
- ? Newspaper notices for child find
- ? Private school/alternative instruction program letter
- ? Review of district referral forms
- ? Interviews – teachers & administrators
- ? IEP record review
- ? IDEA waivers
- ? Payment receipts for out of district placements
- ? SAT scores
- ? Orsir data on graduation, dropout, attendance, school-wide functional standards
- ? SIMS reports
- ? CIMP survey on the six principles

Promising Practice

The steering committee concluded in the area of child find the district provides for identification of private/home schooled students that may be eligible for special education services. Interagency agreements are in place to assist in identifying preschool children who may be eligible for special education services. The steering committee found that the district assures that a representative is present at all IEP and placement meetings held for students in an out of district placement. Policy is in place and followed to assure that parents and children attend meetings held out of district.

Maintenance

Child find is in place in the district despite differences in terminology at birth to 5 years of age and 6-21 years of age. Child find decreases at the middle school and high school levels, being replaced by the term “referral”. Through child find and letters to private school administrators, the district makes adequate effort to identify potential special education students enrolled in private schools.

The district has policy for placement of students out of district and is following guidelines as stated in the comprehensive plan. Addendums are written documenting why placement is the least restrictive environment for the student.

Special education staff has had training on functional standards, but not specifically in regular standard testing.

The district is in compliance with the Office of Special Education rules and regulations.

Even though turnover is frequent among special education personnel, the district is doing a good job of recruiting and hiring qualified and certified educators to work with special needs children. The district is doing well with professional development by providing many opportunities for both regular and special educators. More planning needs to be done to facilitate collaboration among special and regular educators for the benefit of all students served in the district.

Needs Improvement

The district needs to test and score all students with the general Stanford Achievement Test, with the exception of students with functional standards in place. Parents need informational training for SAT's, graduation and regular education standard testing explanation.

Out of Compliance

State standards need to be added to IEP goals as there is no evidence of standard based goals on the IEP.

Validation Results

Promising Practices

The monitoring team found that the district has an exemplary Kindergarten and Grade 1 program. Each grade has 5 classrooms. Each classroom has use of a paraeducator for much of the day. This allows for effective inclusion of students with disabilities with maximum support to the regular education staff to implement the modifications each IEP may require. This shows a high recognition that getting children off on the right foot early in their school years promotes a better experience as they progress through the years. In addition, at both the Kindergarten and Middle School levels, core teaming time is scheduled on a daily basis. Core teaming means that teachers have time during the day when they are all out of their classroom at the same time to do planning as a group. All kindergarten teachers follow the curriculum on relatively the same sequence and share teaching strategies with each other. This is also a time when TAT can be done as needed, parent contacts can be made, etc.

Maintenance

As an "area out of compliance", the steering committees identifies state standards need to be added to the IEP goals as there is no evidence of standard based goals on the IEP. The monitoring team could not validate this as an area out of compliance. In all files reviewed, the monitoring team was able to track the skill areas affected by the student's disability to the South Dakota functional content standards. In several instances the number of the specific content standard was included with the goal statement. However, the district is certainly encouraged to pursue alignment of IEP goals with state content standards.

While the steering committee identified child find inclusive of private/home schooled students and preschool children as a promising practice, this is a requirement according to ARSD 24:05:22:01. The monitoring team found through review of data and interviews that the district is adequately meeting this requirement via letters and informal interagency agreement with Head Start.

In addition, the steering committee identified attending out of district placement IEP meetings as a promising practice; this is a requirement according to ARSD 25:05:27:01.01. The monitoring team acknowledges that this can be difficult in our rural state and appreciates the extra effort this may require.

Areas that need improvement

The monitoring team agrees with all areas in need of improvement for general supervision as concluded by the steering committee.

The monitoring team would like to place emphasis and agreement with the conclusions of the steering committee as it relates to the need for improving training efforts for parents, teachers, paraeducators and other individuals involved in the provision of services to students with disabilities. Training was

identified as an area in need of improvement across all six principles and included topic areas such as standardized testing, roles and responsibilities of the general educator to students with disabilities, IEP process, evaluation, parent rights, prior notice and modification/accommodations. Additional topic areas surfaced as technical assistance was provided to staff during the onsite visit. Interviews suggested a strong need for the district to provide staff with additional information regarding behavior intervention strategies and techniques to be used in the classroom. The monitoring team recommends the training areas identified by the steering committee be an integral part of the district's improvement plan.

Areas out of compliance

24:05:24:01. Referral

Referral includes any written request, which brings a student to the attention of a school district administrator as a student who may be in need of special education. A referral made by a parent may be submitted verbally but a district administrator must document it. Other referral sources include screening, classroom teacher, other district personnel, public or private agencies and private schools.

24:05:24:02. Duties of the district after referral

Upon receiving a referral the school district shall conduct an informal review or may proceed with the evaluation process. An informal review includes a conference, if appropriate with the person making the referral and a review of the student record.

24:05:24:03. Duties of a district after informal review.

If, after informal review arising from a parental referral, the district determines that no evaluation is necessary, the district shall inform the parents of its decision and the reasons for the decision. It shall also inform the parents of their due process rights.

24:05:25:05. Eligibility and placement procedures

In interpreting evaluation data for the purpose of determining eligibility and in making placement decisions, each school district shall draw upon information from a variety of sources, ensure information is documented and carefully considered, placement decisions are made by a group of persons, least restrictive environment is considered in placement and that parents are members of any group that makes decisions on the educational placement of their child

File reviews, a review of data, and interview with a variety of district staff suggested a problem with the district's referral process. Contrary to the district comprehensive plan, the procedures used within the district do not allow educators to initiate a referral without first going through the TAT process. A referral made verbally by a parent cannot be acted upon until that parent completes a district referral document. For example, a parent requested testing at the fall parent conference (November). The parent did not return the referral form and another was sent. After further communication by the teacher, the parent returned the referral form in January. Instructions given to the teacher regarding a parent referral prohibited her from intervening until the parent completed the referral form. Through review of 21 files for high school students reviewers found 16 had no record of referral prior to the junior high level. Staff interviewed suggested there are an unusually high number of initial referrals during junior high and high school, frequently for behavior concerns.

Through file reviews and interviews the team concluded that parents are not always afforded the right to be involved in determining eligibility of their child or in making placement decisions.

Examples include:

- ? 4th grade student evaluated 1/4/02. The single prior notice sent, documented that grandmother called stating that she could not attend, "As rescheduling was not an option I gave her suggestions and said I would send paperwork home. If she has questions she said she would call me."
- ? 8th grade student, Prior notices dated 1/3/02 and 1/7/02 state "...does not qualify for special education at this time..." The decision was made by the special educator without involving the team.

- ? Two 4th graders: Prior notice sent once. Parent was not included in multidisciplinary team meeting or at the IEP when the IEP team decided that the child was not eligible. Administrative rule requires that parents receive prior notice two to three times, using a variety of methods, before proceeding to meet without them. Parent interviews revealed that their children were “chronically on detention” but no one within the district explained the possibility of a multidisciplinary evaluation to consider why behavior was continually unacceptable.
- ? One parent of a child being evaluated for eligibility under other health impaired requested Section 504 consideration. The team determined the child did not qualify for special education, however, the referral for eligibility under Section 504 was never made.
- ? Student on TAT as of 9/5/01, prior notice for consent to evaluate sent 10/02/01, no response from parent. On 4/24/02 parent called and indicated she had never her rights explained, and she wanted her son tested.

Principle 2 – Free Appropriate Public Education

All eligible children with disabilities are entitled to a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment. The specific areas addressed in principle two are the provision of FAPE to children residing in group homes, foster homes, or institutions, making FAPE available when a child reaches his/her 3rd birthday and providing FAPE to eligible children with disabilities who have been suspended or expelled from school for more than 10 cumulative days.

Steering Committee Self-Assessment Summary

Data sources used:

- ? Policy Manual
- ? Comprehensive plan
- ? IEP reviews
- ? Surveys
- ? Training information
- ? State data table I (Age & Placement Alternatives)
- ? State data table K (Early Intervention (Part C) Exit Information)
- ? Billing review
- ? Budgets

Maintenance

Policies are in compliance with education standards, regulations, and OSE policies and procedures.

Students are being served at the expense of the district and in the most appropriate setting. Students are receiving the services that are appropriate for their specific needs at no cost to the parents.

The district used the state and federal standards, which resulted in no complaints or hearings. Training is in place to make staff aware of requirements. There were not any suspensions or expulsions.

Areas that need improvement

General education staff needs to be more informed about the special education services and their legal obligations to students with disabilities. Input from students and parents should be gathered on a regular basis.

Validation Results

Promising Practice

Through interview and observation the monitoring team considers the JAM After-School Program to be a promising practice in the Belle Fourche School District. The program is available for all students at no cost and is operational during the school year and also in the summer. Sites for the program include one at an elementary building, one at middle school and one at high school. Students can ride a bus to the site of choice. A snack is provided. The sites are all staffed with certified teachers. Options for activities include homework help, computer lab, variety of academic and craft activities, and socialization opportunities. The program is funded through a federal grant written by their educational cooperative.

Through interview and observation the monitoring team considers the Peer Tutoring Program for the high school to be a promising practice in the Belle Fourche School District. The program consists of junior and senior level students who volunteer to be tutors. They must have a 3.0 grade average or better. These students are then paired with freshman and sophomore students who may request help because they are struggling in one or more subjects. Parents of the students requesting help are contacted to obtain permission for their child to participate. The students being tutored sign a contract outlining their responsibility to meet all appointment times promptly, bring all needed materials, come prepared to cooperate and learn, and treat tutors with respect. Tutors will not provide answers, they will find a way to help the student find the answers. There is no guarantee of grade improvement. Responsibility for completion of the work and for improving study skills remains with the student requesting help.

Areas that need improvement

The monitoring team agrees with all areas in need of improvement for Free Appropriate Public Education as concluded by the steering committee. General education staff needs to be more informed about the special education services and their legal obligations to students with disabilities. Input from students and parents should be gathered on a regular basis.

Principle 3 – Appropriate Evaluation

A comprehensive evaluation is conducted by a team of knowledgeable staff, which also includes parental input. A valid and reliable evaluation will result in effective individualized education programs for eligible students. The specific areas addressed in principle three are written notice and consent for evaluation, evaluation procedures and instruments, eligibility determination, reevaluation and continuing eligibility.

Steering Committee Self-Assessment Summary

Data sources used:

- ? IEP Files
- ? Surveys: Instructional Staff, Parents, Special Education Staff, Administrators
- ? Comprehensive Plan
- ? Evaluator Credentials

Promising Practices

Based on file review, surveys, and the comprehensive plan, the steering committee identified as a promising practice the areas of evaluation procedures and instruments, reevaluation and continued eligibility, and comprehensive evaluation.

Maintenance

The district needs to ensure parents understand the evaluation results. Parents and regular educators may need more training and interpretation of evaluation results. The district needs to address the discrepancy between parent's initials on the IEP, indicating that they have received a copy of the parental rights, and the parent survey results show that they don't remember getting them.

Validation Results

Promising Practices

The monitoring team could not validate the overall evaluation procedures the district uses as a promising practice because IDEA requires schools to evaluate students in all areas of suspected disability for initial eligibility and then every three years. Although, through interview and observation the monitoring team does consider the early intervention arena assessments completed at the preschool level for children ages birth to five to be a promising practice in the Belle Fourche School District. The evaluation team consists of an early childhood special education teacher, occupational therapist, physical therapist, and speech/language clinician. The team typically schedules evaluations in the physical therapy area of the school. When the child and parent come for the evaluation, time is taken to warm them to the environment through free play and conversation. Based on which evaluator the child warms up to best, that evaluator becomes the one who interacts with the child for the evaluation. All the other evaluators give signals to that evaluator regarding what they want the child to do. Each evaluator may have a different evaluation instrument they are completing. If a child simply does not respond in this setting, the team reschedules a visit to do the evaluation in the child's home.

Areas that need improvement

Through a review of all student files and staff interview the monitoring team determined an area in need of improvement to be the district evaluation procedures. The Weschler Intelligence Scale for Children III and the Weschler Individual Achievement Test were the only evaluation tools available to acquire the ability and achievement scores to determine eligibility. Other achievement tools are available and may produce better information for a particular student; however, the option to deviate from this set of instruments was not available.

Areas out of compliance

24:05:25:04 Evaluation procedures

School districts shall ensure, at a minimum, a child is assessed in all areas related to the suspected disability and those evaluation procedures include a variety of assessment tools and strategies to gather relevant functional and developmental information about the child. This is to include information provided by parents that may assist in determining whether the child is a child with a disability and the content of the child's IEP.

In 73% of the student files reviewed and through interview, the monitoring team found the district to be unfamiliar with the functional assessment requirement. District staff did not include functional information in the evaluation process. District staff does not understand that this information is to be used for determining specific skills areas affected by the student's disability, eligibility, present levels of academic performance, their progress in the general curriculum, and development of annual goals and short term instructional objectives. Functional assessment information is available through a variety of sources in the district, however, there is not an established process for administering, collecting,

summarizing or integrating the information into the 25-day evaluation process for determining eligibility or developing the student's IEP.

Through review of 21 files of children referred but not placed and staff interviews the team concluded that in determining eligibility under the disability of emotional disturbance, the district considers academic performance through achievement scores and aptitude through IQ scores only. Even when social/emotional testing is also completed for a student and reveals scores falling in the clinically significant range, these areas, crucial to determining eligibility are not considered. Eligibility determination for emotional disturbance should include information about such things as significant decline in overall academic performance, inability to concentrate and/or participate as directed by an adult not consistent with development, inability to attend school for emotional reasons, and inability to maintain relationships with adults and peers. One or more of these conditions may prevent the student from participating in classroom learning. In only one of the files did the team find clinical observations, behavior logs or anecdotal records to address emotional ability and/or behavioral functioning. Examples of findings in the files for which students did not qualify when emotional disturbance was considered include:

- ? 9th grade student referred for behavior concerns. The district did not seek consent to evaluate social/emotional areas. Consent was acquired for aptitude and achievement and appropriate evaluations were completed in those areas. A classroom teacher filled out the Behavior Assessment System for Children but the psychologist did not score it. The district did not evaluate in all areas of suspected disability nor did the district obtain consent for the behavior assessments that were completed.
- ? Student referred initially to TAT on 10/21/97 for behavior concerns and finally evaluated because of academic and behavioral concerns with the WIAT on 10/1/01 and WISC 10/16/01. Scores on social emotional instruments were clinically significant, some above 70. No classroom observations, clinical observations, or anecdotal records were completed as part of the assessment process.

24:05:25:04.02 Determination of needed evaluation data.

As part of the evaluation process, a team of individuals reviews existing evaluation data on a child. With input from parents, the team is to identify what additional data is needed, if any, to determine if the student has a disability, identify present levels of performance, and determine whether the student needs special education and related services. In eleven of thirty files reviewed, the monitoring team could not verify parents had been afforded the opportunity to provide input into the evaluation process of their child.

24:05:25:11. Observation for specific learning disabilities

24:05:25:12. Written report for specific learning disabilities

At least one team member other than the child's regular teacher must observe the child's academic performance in the regular classroom setting. The team shall prepare a written report of the results of the evaluation for specific learning disabilities. The report must include a statement of the relevant behavior noted during the observations of the child.

Written reports for specific learning disabilities were not completed for six of twelve SLD files reviewed. Of the six available written reports, five contained incomplete information regarding the student observation or there was no evidence of an observation having been conducted. Staff interviews confirmed a recent awareness of the need to meet this requirement for student suspected as having a specific learning disability.

Principle 4 – Procedural Safeguards

Parents of children with disabilities have certain rights available. The school makes parents aware of these rights and makes sure they are understood. The specific areas addressed in principle four are adult student/transfer of rights, content of rights, consent, written notice, confidentiality and access to records, independent educational evaluation (IEE), complaint procedures, and due process hearings.

Steering Committee Self-Assessment Summary

Data sources used:

- ? Parental Rights Form
- ? Consent Form
- ? Written Notice Form
- ? Memos
- ? IEP file review
- ? FERPA
- ? Special Education Director interview
- ? School personnel interviews
- ? Confidential Information Form
- ? Comprehensive Plan
- ? Parent interview
- ? Policy Manual

Promising Practices

The district exhibits promising practices in the areas of confidentiality, access to records, adult student/transfer of rights, and written notice content itself under content of parental rights.

Areas that need improvement

Training personnel in each of the sub-principles within the area of procedural safeguards is needed.

Areas out of compliance

Parental rights are not provided to parents in many cases, e.g., refusals to test children with obvious behavior issues and other problems. Therefore, parents do not know of their right to file a complaint with DECA or request evaluations or an independent educational evaluation (IEE), or many other rights (Procedural Safeguards) that parents have.

Validation Results

Maintenance

While the district considers the fact that the areas of confidentiality, access to records, adult student/transfer of rights, and written notice of parental rights are a promising practice, and the monitoring team agrees this occurs adequately in the Belle Fourche district, these procedures are required IDEA practices.

Areas that need improvement

The monitoring team concurs with the steering committee's identification of the need for training personnel in all areas of procedural safeguards.

Areas out of compliance

24:05:30:05. Content of notice

Written notice, which contains all regulatory content, must be provided to parents before the district proposes or refuses to initiate or change the identification, evaluation, or educational placement of the child or the provision of a free appropriate public education to the child. In three files reviewed parents were not provided a description of each evaluation procedures to be administered to their child. In two files reviewed, a description of the action proposed by the district was not included in the prior notice to the parents. In two other instances, a letter was sent to the parents informing them that a meeting was to be held. The letter did not contain any of the content required in written notice or assurances that the parents were afforded information regarding procedural safeguards.

Principle 5 – Individualized Education Program

The Individualized Education Program (IEP) is a written document for a child with a disability that is developed, reviewed and revised by the IEP team, which includes the parent. The specific areas addressed in principle five are IEP team, IEP content, transition components for secondary IEPs, annual reviews, transition from early intervention program, and IEP related issues.

Steering Committee Self-Assessment Summary

Data sources used:

- ? IEP file review: cover page, goal page, transition, related services, ESY, progress reports, use of technology
- ? Personnel Development Plan
- ? Personnel Training Agendas
- ? Parent survey
- ? Student survey
- ? Budget information

Promising Practices

The steering committee has concluded that from all areas reviewed, the IEP documentation is in order. The “pattern” at all sites seems to be in order on the IEP files. Interviews with parents and teachers show that the resource rooms/learning centers are positive environments and helps students to be successful in the classroom.

Maintenance

Personnel issues were determined to fall in the maintenance category. Although the district is in compliance, parent/teacher surveys show that we could offer more support and/or training for parental growth.

Validation Results

Promising Practices

Through file reviews and interviews the monitoring team found that work experience opportunities for transition are exemplary and allow for individual needs in terms of the amount of supervision, mentoring, etc. required for success. A job coach is available to work with each student to insure success on the job or adjustment of the assigned work site. Options involve very structured, carefully monitored sites such

as the Northern Hills Training Center in Spearfish to an independent work site in a business in Belle Fourche. The school has developed positive collaboration with a variety of agencies and businesses to insure transition work experiences are truly designed to enhance work maturity and independence for the students.

Areas that need improvement

The monitoring team agrees with the steering committee's conclusion that more support and/or training for parents are needed. This is an area that needs improvement in order to prevent it becoming non-compliance issue in the future.

In all of the IEP files reviewed and through interview, the monitoring team concluded the need for the district to adopt a uniform set of IEP documents and procedures to be used by all staff across all grade levels as an area in need of improvement. The lack of consistency is contributing to errors that, even though are not systemic, individually have the potential to become a serious problem.

Areas out of compliance

24:05:27:01.03 Content of individualized education program

A student's IEP must contain present levels of performance based upon the skill areas affected by the students identified disability. The present levels of performance are based upon the functional assessment information gather during the comprehensive evaluation process. In all files reviewed, present levels of performance were not linked to evaluation and did not contain the student's academic strengths, needs or their involvement in the general curriculum. Therefore, the student's annual goals were not consistently written as measurable or observable skills linked to the present levels of performance and did not represent what the student could reasonably accomplish within a 12-month period. For example, "...will complete daily living skills in small group," "will read and comprehend at level Q," and "improve visual processing and spatial skills by mastering 80% of the following objectives."

The IEP must describe individual modifications needed by the student, the anticipated frequency, location, and duration of those modifications. All IEPs reviewed by the team did not consistently describe the frequency, location or duration of the needed modifications. Two IEPs included statements such as "as needed" or "when needed". In determining what modifications would be needed for state/district wide assessments, the IEPs contained a list of modifications that did not correlate with how the student would be tested on a regular basis or the testing modifications required by the student to benefit from their program.

24:05:27:01.01. Team membership

The regular education teacher of a student with a disability, as a member of the individualized education program team, must, to the extent appropriate, participate in the development, review, and revision of the student's individualized education program, including assisting in the determination of appropriate positive behavioral interventions and strategies for the student and the determination of supplementary aids and services, program modifications, and supports for school personnel that will be provided for the student.

In 50% of the files for high schools students for which in-depth file reviews were completed there was no evidence that a regular high school teacher attended the meetings. The guidance counselor was frequently present but he does not teach. Through interviews with both special educators and regular educators, the monitoring team was able to verify that high school teachers do not attend the IEP meeting, instead they complete a form reflecting student information, performance and concerns.

24:05:25:26. Extended school year authorized

Through interview, district staff stated they did not collect data to support or refute the need for extended year services by a student. The district might provide physical therapy or occupational therapy service to a student during the summer but does not identify it as extended school year services. Interviews also suggested the basis for determining that a student would receive extended school year service was parental request. Two IEPs did not specify what services would be provided/needed during extended school year. Three IEPs reviewed stated extended school year services were needed, however the length of the school day and duration of extended school year services based on the individual child's needs was not addressed.

Principle 6 – Least Restrictive Environment

After the IEP is developed or reviewed, the IEP team must decide where the IEP services are to be provided. Consideration begins in the general education classroom for school age students. The specific areas addressed in principle six are placement decisions, consent for initial placement, least restrictive environment procedures, preschool children, and LRE related issues.

Steering Committee Self-Assessment Summary

Data sources used

- ? Surveys: teachers, administrators, students, parents
- ? Teacher interview
- ? LRE survey

Promising practices

Students with disabilities participate in all school activities including field trips, clubs, internships, sports and assemblies.

Maintenance

The district utilizes the resources of community-based organizations to improve services to students with disabilities.

Areas that need improvement

The district needs more training for general educators/paraprofessionals in the areas of modification and accommodation. The district needs a more efficient use of staff and resources to help with time constraints.

The district is lacking uniformity in the IEP format. It is not inclusive of what is being measured. There is no evidence in the IEP to support the interaction of child receiving early intervention with that of non-disabled peers.

Validation Results

Maintenance

The steering committee identified that students with disabilities participate in all school activities including field trips, clubs, internships, sports, and assemblies as a promising practice, and the monitoring

team agrees this happens routinely in the Belle Fourche District. However, since it is a requirement of IDEA, it does not constitute promising practice.

Areas that need improvement

The monitoring team concurs with the steering committee's conclusion that the district needs more training for general educators and paraprofessionals in the areas of modification and accommodation.

The district needs a more efficient use of staff and resources to help with time constraints especially at the middle school and high school level.

The monitoring team concurs with the steering committee's conclusion that there is no evidence in the IEP to support the interaction of the children receiving early intervention students with that of non-disabled peers.